

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

May 2, 2001

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

David Adams, Chair
Keith Stepan, Vice-Chair
Joseph Jenkins
Haze Hunter
Larry Jardine
Kerry Casaday
Lynne Ward (ex-officio)

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Richard E. Byfield, AIA	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Robert Woodhead	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kenneth Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Leslee Chavez	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alyn Lunceford	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
David McKay	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Bruce Whittington	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Doug Fullmer	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cheryl Searle	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Lynn Hinrichs	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Will Thornley	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Rick James	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Attorney Generals Office/DFCM
Greg Peay	Department of Corrections
Brent Windley	Utah State University
John Huish	University of Utah
Randy Turpin	University of Utah
Paul Platt	Courts
Rosemarie Carter	Department of Workforce Services
David H. Hart	Capitol Preservation Board
Cecilia H. Foxley	USHE - State Board of Regents
Brad Mortensen	USHE – State Board of Regents

Donna Dahl	Fairpark
Richard N. Jones	Uintah Basin ATC
Bart Morrill	Uintah Basin ATC
Richard Maughn	Bridgerland ATC
David Clark	UDAF
Greg Stauffer	Southern Utah University
Ned E. Carnahan	Dixie State College
Raymond Duda	Utah National Guard
Peter Wilson	Utah National Guard
Ted Frandsen	Utah National Guard
Kim G. Passey	State Fire Marshall
Richard Clasby	Department of Corrections/UCI
Bill Juszczak	Department of Transportation
Larry Lee	College of Eastern Utah – San Juan Campus
Dennis Geary	College of Eastern Utah
Karen Bliss	College of Eastern Utah
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
Gordon Storrs	Salt Lake Community College
Karen Krieger	Department of Natural Resources/Parks & Recreation
Gary Thorson	Department of Natural Resources/Parks & Recreation
Lynn Samsel	Department of Human Services
Bart Hopkin	Department of Human Services
Mark E. Ward	Department of Human Services

On Wednesday, May 2, 2001, a regularly scheduled Utah State Building Board meeting was held in the Utah State Capitol, Committee Room 129, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chairman David Adams called the meeting to order at 9:00a.m. and welcomed Leslee Chavez as a new employee of DFCM.

☐ APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2001 AND APRIL 11, 2001

Chairman Adams sought comments on the March 21, 2001 meeting. He noted several follow-up items requiring attention including a Value Based Procurement seminar within 30-60 days for contractors to obtain further knowledge and education on the system, further discussion on Legislative Auditor actions, and Mr. Stepan providing the Board with the information pertaining to utility conservation from the Salt Lake Airport Authority. Kenneth Nye offered to coordinate the audit information and utility information for follow-up at the June 6 meeting.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2001 meeting. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams sought comments on the April 11, 2001 meeting minutes. Haze Hunter

proposed deleting his comment on page 12 in order to better clarify the paragraph's meaning.

Mr. Stepan requested clarification of the status of supporting Higher Education's decision pertaining to the Shakespearean festival. Richard Byfield commented the concern was the relationship between the Shakespearean festival and Southern Utah University. Higher Education determined the relationship should stay connected and not become autonomous.

DFCM later met with President Bennion, Norm Tarbox, Fred Adams and DFCM staff to discuss the mechanics of the process and how to proceed. DFCM is now preparing an analysis of all alternative delivery methods to be managed by DFCM in concert with Southern Utah University to aid the Shakespeare festival.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to approve the minutes of April 11, 2001 with the deletion of his comment. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

☐ ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Kenneth Nye briefly overviewed the Legislature's actions pertaining to the capital improvement accounts and proceeding with the expanded authority on those funds. Kent Beers distributed DFCM's recommendations for capital improvement projects for FY2002 and explained the Legislature authorized 1% of the replacement value of the state owned buildings, equaling \$44 million in capital improvement funding. The Legislature also authorized DFCM to increase the limit per project up to \$1.5 million. A few projects were close to the \$1.5 million limit and definitely exceeded the previous \$1 million limit on the list of DFCM's recommendations.

Mr. Beers directed the Board's attention to those items that had been revised since the previous list. On page 4, line 171, the Uintah Basin Applied Technology Center remodel of the donated doctor's office at the Vernal branch campus was revised from its original recommendation. Since then, DFCM completed a condition assessment conducted on this building and examined the extent of the remodel. Through their analysis, DFCM determined the building was worthy of the remodel as requested and recommended the project for the \$275,000 noted.

Mr. Jenkins questioned the viability of maintaining an ATC campus in Vernal and felt this was granting permission to move a campus to Vernal. He felt the permission should be granted by the controlling agency of the ATCs, after the governance issue is resolved in a special session of the Legislature. He felt the Board should postpone their decision until the Vernal campus ATC status was determined. Kent Beers did not wish to mislead the Board of the fact that pods already existed and classes were held there.

Dick Jones, Superintendent of UBATC, stated the UBATC currently operates in Vernal with a campus and anticipates continuing to do so in the future irrespective of obtaining a new building. They need to continue to serve the secondary students from Uintah High School, but it is not feasible to bus those students to Roosevelt one hour each day. The requested building would grant them 5,000sf more to allow them to work with the students much more effectively and is only approximately 150 feet from the facility they are paying extensive lease on each year. The UBATC could extend their student enrollment dramatically and better serve the students of Uintah High School.

Chairman Adams proposed compromising by earmarking the funds and holding them in a deferred basis pending the outcome of the decision made in a special session of the Legislature dealing with governance of the institutions. Joe Jenkins and Dr. Jones felt it was a fair compromise to hold the funds in abeyance until the decision was made to have a campus in Vernal.

Kenneth Nye stated the condition assessment identified a number of items dealing with the heating and cooling systems and indicated they would need to be done within the next two to five years.

MOTION: Joe Jenkins moved that Item 171 be funded, but held in abeyance until a decision is reached confirming there will be an ATC campus in Vernal. The motion was seconded by Lynne Ward and passed unanimously.

Kenneth Nye confirmed the motion requested the Board's concurrence in the future, prior to proceeding with the project.

Kent Beers referred to page 8, line 384, Department of Workforce Services Metro Building, and stated that within the last week, DFCM's roofing inspectors discovered a leak in the roof, which needs to be repaired immediately. Therefore, DFCM requested that \$48,000 be applied toward the immediate repair of the roof.

The projects recommended totaled \$44,982,600. The funds were broken out with the Legislature appropriating \$43,994,000, DFCM provided \$266,514 from the asbestos litigation settlement, \$674,086 came from funds previously set aside for energy projects which are being transferred to this years' current improvement projects, and \$48,000 for the roof repair came from unallocated roofing funds.

Chairman Adams questioned line item 27, the elevator replacement for the Technology and

Administration buildings at Salt Lake Community College on Redwood Road, and questioned the high cost. Bob Askerlund, SLCC representative, stated the request was to replace the operating mechanism in both of the elevators in the Technology building. The Administration building elevator is the most frequent breakdown elevator and requires total replacement of the hydraulic system. While none of the elevators are inoperable, all are frequently repaired.

Joe Jenkins asked how item 38, page 1, increased from \$85,000 to \$1,148,000. Kent Beers explained Snow College had three to four steam line breaks over the last three years. Since the steam lines are direct buried and corroding in the ground, \$85,000 was requested for a direct bury replacement and address the break in the line. DFCM conducted an analysis on the project and felt implementing a tunnel system was a better solution. The increased dollar amount reflects the desire to put a steam line section into a tunnel system, which would be the fourth segment of tunnel constructed at Snow College. The last stretch of tunnel put in connected to Old Main. Kent Beers clarified two other sections would be requested in the future for tunnels.

Chairman Adams directed the Board to page two, item 79, and questioned if Federal Way needs to be paved in order prepare for the Olympic venues. Kent Beers responded this was not new paving and was only to apply a slurry seal over existing paving. All paving seal coats ranked as a priority number one this year were recommended by DFCM. The paving manager indicated this could wait another year until it is done, but would come forward again next year.

Chairman Adams directed the Board to the major roofing project at Utah Valley State College Gunther Trades Building on page three. Kent Beers assured the Board it could wait another year. Chairman Adams questioned if the Weber State Building Campus Services #20, item 134, could also hold another year to which Kent Beers affirmed.

One page five, item number 213, Travel Council Paint Fixture Window Treatment and Exhibits, Chairman Adams asked if the Board should ensure the building was exemplary since it would be used quite extensively for visitors coming to the Olympics. Kent Beers stated it was his understanding the work was for the interior of the Travel Council. Line 215 was recommended by DFCM to cover some improvements on the exterior. Chairman Adams asked if the work could be completed all at once. Kenneth Nye observed that a large portion of the project was for items not usually funded through capital improvement funds. The general repairs could be eligible, but exhibits were viewed as furniture. Chairman Adams felt all should be maintained exemplary due to the Olympics.

Richard Byfield noted the general maintenance items could be addressed on the interior of the building for less than \$75,000 if the Board wish to do so. Joe Jenkins agreed with

Chairman Adams' suggestion of painting, but also agreed with not providing any furniture, window treatments, or exhibits, which should be provided out of the operating budget. The suggested \$35,000 would be sufficient for the exterior painting, however Jack Quintana felt the \$35,000 was to cover exterior painting and some needed interior painting. David Hart confirmed and proposed using money set aside by the Preservation Board and transferring some funds to cover painting without using it for furniture, exhibits or window coverings, and then reporting back to the Building Board. Chairman Adams asked Mr. Hart to also encourage the Travel Council to use their internal funds for the remainder of the proposed work.

Kent Beers clarified the water heater at the Ogden Regional Center, page 6, item 261, had been completed and they were requesting reimbursement for \$16,000. He had since responded to them to fund it through their operations and maintenance.

Chairman Adams called for other items from the Board pertaining to the list of improvement items.

Lynne Ward questioned page 5, line 224, Draper Security System Audit, for \$62,700, which was not recommended by DFCM. Kent Beers elaborated that the project was for the Prison to conduct an audit on their existing security systems to identify the shortcomings and also recommend increased security systems. After DFCM discussed the issue, they felt it was better funded through Corrections themselves than as an improvement item as it was more of an equipment issue. Lynne Ward requested the Department involve DFCM throughout the process.

Greg Peay, Department of Corrections, explained that approximately seven years ago an evaluation was performed on their security system and found the systems in place at that time were insufficient to prevent undetected escapes from the perimeter. Being sensitive to those results, they wished to perform a similar exercise with an outside consultant specializing in those procedures and proceed with a thorough evaluation to look for weaknesses in the current system and update them to improve their perimeters with new advances in technology and make their perimeters bullet proof. Mr. Peay felt they would need to return next year to request funding if the funds could not be found this year. He hoped it would be funded this year as Corrections felt fairly confident that their systems should be upgraded within the next two to three years. The current system has been in place for approximately six years and continues to be tested twice daily, however some issues have arisen concerning vulnerability in a few zones around the perimeter.

Lynne Ward asked for a distinction in having DFCM not pay for security issues. Kenneth Nye responded that DFCM viewed the security system involved other components within

Corrections, not just the buildings, and felt security issues should be part of a Correction's budget issue as opposed to a capital improvement issue. Specific improvements identified to improve security could be requested in the future through capital improvements. Mr. Peay added that the Department would use this money to define what other improvements would be needed in the future for equipment or operations. He did not have a cost estimate due to some technological advances in camera systems and proximity detection systems they wished to investigate. They wished to hire a consultant who was familiar with the systems and could advise them of their application and cost. Lynne Ward agreed with DFCM's recommendation that it was an operational issue for the Department and encouraged them to proceed with the audit, identify the facility items, and then return to the Board to seek AR&I funds.

Chairman Adams opened up the forum to the audience for comments.

Donna Dahl, Fairpark, referenced DFCM's recommendation of limitations on when the \$308,000 could be spent.

Kent Beers clarified DFCM's recommendation was for \$108,000 to be used for design of the mall area at the Fairpark. If the cost of the design was less than \$108,000, then the balance of money could be used for miscellaneous improvements at the Fairpark. The \$200,000 would be held in reserve, pending the outcome of the study of the future of the Fairpark.

Ms. Dahl apprised the Board of Senate Bill 268 and stated many studies have been performed on the Fairpark. Two years ago, ERA performed a study on the viability of moving the State Fair and deemed it was not viable to move it without losing the identity. The Fairpark ground could not be sold to place the Fair elsewhere, as the property along North Temple was no more valuable than the homes in the area. The Governor later had another study done after the bonds of \$10.5 million were approved, which resulted in them only willing to pay for \$4 million, while trying to determine the difference.

The Fairpark requested the \$4.1 million from the Legislature with an additional one-time appropriation of \$7 million to replace the coliseum removed in 1996. At that time, there was some proposed legislation to develop a committee to study the viability of the property and report back to the Legislature in the fall. She did not think the Fairpark would be sold based on the studies and the Legislatures desires.

Ms. Dahl stated the coliseum was demolished in 1996 and the Fairpark was appropriated money to complete a new infrastructure. After several delays due to other imminent projects, the funding was reallocated for use on transformers. The Fairpark Board felt very strongly that the center mall be completed within the next three to four years and requested \$108,000 to

complete the design and begin funding the new telephone lines. Last year, \$50,000 was allocated for the telephone lines, but those funds only covered pulling the conduit to the gates. Another \$50,000 was needed to pull permanent lines. The Fairpark Board was also willing to match the \$200,000 to complete the center mall within the next three years, while they wait for a final decision on relocation to be made. Therefore, Ms. Dahl was requesting permission to use the \$108,000 for distribution of \$50,000 to support the telephone system and the rest to cover the architect's fees for the mall remodel. She also wish for the additional \$200,000 previously restricted by DFCM until a determination of the sale of the Fairpark was finalized, to be released for spending. She stated that the Fairpark would contribute a substantial amount in order to proceed immediately with the full project.

Chairman Adams sought a motion.

MOTION: Keith Stepan moved to remove the restriction on the Fairpark and restore the funds. The motion was seconded by Joe Jenkins and passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams sought any further comments from other agencies pertaining to the capital improvement funds.

Kenneth Nye highlighted the policy dealing with energy issues and noted the Board and DFCM have tried for several years to improve the energy efficiency of state buildings. In past years, the Board allocated and set aside money for energy projects with the intent that projects would be identified and approved by the Board before proceeding. The Board operated under a program where the operating agency or institution would repay the cost of the completed project through energy savings. DFCM has had difficulty with getting owners to aggressively pursue energy issues largely based on the requirement of proceeding on a loan basis where funds would be repaid out of savings. It was further complicated when the Quality Growth Act passed a few years ago, which reallocated half of the net savings to another fund. Therefore, DFCM recommended this year that those projects be funded outright, and not on a loan basis, due to the increasing concerns regarding energy throughout the United States and the general desire to increase the energy program participation. DFCM identified those projects with significant energy aspects within their recommendations and suggested holding the \$1,925,000 previously set aside for energy projects, while potential energy projects are analyzed over the next few months to identify those with the greatest potential for savings to be presented to the Board for approval.

Chairman Adams sought a motion to adopt the capital improvement fund budget as presented by Mr. Beers and modified by the Building Board.

MOTION: Joe Jenkins moved to adopt the capital improvement fund budget for FY2002 as presented by Mr. Beers and modified by the Building Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hunter and passed unanimously.

☐ CAPITOL PRESERVATION BOARD UPDATE.....

David Hart, Executive Director of the Capitol Preservation Board, distributed a 20-year master plan approved by the Capitol Preservation Board on March 28, 2001. The master plan reviews eight different phases of restoring the capitol and its grounds to the original intentions.

The first 10 years were considered the major building years and included the two new buildings funded by the Legislature and being pursued by the Preservation Board. The master plan also identified the restoration and base isolation of the Capitol, including upgrading the facilities, exhibits, and memorials located on the front lawn. The ending 10 years would serve as a basic analysis period with the primary emphasis on analyzing additional growth and reductions on Capitol Hill.

The Preservation Board also approved its' design guideline imperatives, which basically set forth the directions and imperatives given to the architects asked to design the two new buildings. Those imperatives state the buildings will resemble the capitol and follow the same basic architectural design elements with regards to rhythm, format, and materials, as well as height limits.

The Preservation Board was currently in the process of preparing the design guidelines for the restoration of the Capitol, which called for analyzing the historic nature of the Capitol and determining the procedure to return back to the basic original design while minimizing the impact on government. The analogy will occur in the summer of 2001 with hopes to have a budget developed by the end of the year.

On May 1, a selection committee interviewed construction managers from Okland Construction, Big D Construction and Jacobsen Construction. Jacobsen Construction will be recommended to the Preservation Board in the June meeting to serve as the construction manager. Jacobsen Construction will begin the architect selection process in preparation to proceed in June.

Chairman Adams requested a brief overview of the winning proposal description of the architectural agreement; given the fact the Building Board recently modified their owner/architect agreement. Mr. Hart responded the construction manager will be responsible for the project and work under a fixed limit of construction cost for the two new buildings, but cannot perform or self-perform any work. Along with the architect and Mr. Hart, the

construction manager will arrive at a design for the two new buildings within the fixed limit of construction cost. The agreement proposed by the construction manager to the architect includes requiring various limits of insurance be placed upon various consultants and the architect, and strong provisions pertaining to performance.

Alan Bachman commended Mr. Hart for his efforts in working with DFCM to coordinate contracts and provisions in a statewide effort, as well as the architect's agreement. Mr. Bachman coordinated with the Preservation Board to incorporate many of the provisions included in DFCM's negotiations. The architectural agreement clearly identifies the expectations and performance levels required of the architect as they work on the project. Chairman Adams thanked Mr. Hart for his comments.

❑ **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**

John Huish stated five A/E agreements were awarded for the period of March 2 to April 13, 2001. One construction contract was awarded for \$583,000 for the biology lab remodel.

Chairman Adams participated in the selection for the programmer for the Moran Eye Clinic and requested the status. Mr. Huish responded the Moran Eye Center had not been delegated yet and would be assessed once the project was fully defined with a clear time line.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to accept the delegated project report for the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Kerry Casaday and passed unanimously.

Brent Windley from Utah State University stated one new mechanical contract was initiated for mechanical on the Western Medical Center and is scheduled for completion in August. The first phase of the consolidation of the chiller replacement approved at the last meeting is underway. An architect will be chosen for the Biology Natural Resources façade project on May 3.

The Lyric Theatre Renovation is a very specific type of theatre and needed to be upgraded in order to use it for the general public due to fire safety issues. The expected completion date is May 8.

A web site with a fixed camera has been developed for the steam tunnel project to apprise the campus of the developments taking place. A progress chart identifies where and when digging will occur.

MOTION: **Larry Jardine moved to approve the delegated project report from Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.**

☐ AMENDMENTS TO RULE23-1, PROCUREMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.....

Joe Jenkins credited Alan Bachman and Kenneth Nye for their work on the amendment, which is a total change in the procurement process and brings Value Based Procurement to the forefront. The rule designates Value Based Procurement as the preferred basis for the State of Utah with an understanding that low-bid is allowed on projects less than \$250,000 or \$250,000-\$1 million, as determined by the Director for the State's best interest or in the case of commodities. The amendment requires Board vote to go into rulemaking and then become part of the operational rules of DFCM.

Kenneth Nye stated the statute grants the Board the authority to adopt the procurement rules for DFCM. Issues dealing with Value Based Procurement were the primary genesis for pursuing the rule changes, as well as addressing several housekeeping issues and policy decisions. A new version of the proposed amendments was distributed. Changes from the version that was included in the packet were highlighted and were made based on comments received after the packet was issued.

Joe Jenkins commented there was no provision on how to distinguish between two low bidders in a low-bid process if it is a tie, and asked that it be included as a coin toss. Under Value Based Procurement, the coin toss is unnecessary because the selection committee makes the determination in that unlikely scenario.

Kenneth Nye identified another principal issue dealt with the confidentiality of reference information received in the Value Based Procurement process. By adopting this wording, the Board is ensuring the information requires confidentiality in order to maintain the integrity of the procurement process and obtain information needed to pursue procurement. DFCM previously had discussions about the need for references to remain confidential and allow individuals to speak freely without the fear of retribution. Through the paragraph wording, any legal challenges based on the ability to maintain the confidentiality of those references would serve as a key element of any litigation claims.

Chairman Adams questioned the feasibility of mechanically insuring confidentiality within the Division. Kenneth Nye responded DFCM would enter the data into a password protected database with very limited access. Summary information would be more broadly available,

however the structure of the process was not confirmed. Chairman Adams stressed the importance of securing the hard copy work and making it inaccessible.

Joe Jenkins commented that advertisements for projects would slowly begin to be distributed electronically as the paramount basis for the source of information.

In the past, DFCM has had a provision regarding bid security. This provision of providing a cashiers or certified check will be eliminated to ensure the bidder has the ability to provide payment and performance bonds. There has also been a problem with bid bonds not being submitted on the DFCM form. Under the current rule, DFCM has declared those bids as non-responsive, which has cost DFCM a significant amount of money when being forced to pursue a different bidder. The amendment will allow an incorrect form to be replaced within 24 hours.

Chairman Adams asked for public input pertaining to Rule 23 and the amendments of May 1, 2001 as they apply to the Department of Administrative Services, Division of Facilities Construction & Management. Kenneth Nye clarified the process for the rulemaking, which would allow DFCM to proceed with the Board's approval, to submit the rule to the Division of Administrative Rules and then formally publish the rule in the rulemaking process for a period of 30 days to allow public input. At that time, DFCM will report back to the Board to receive final approval to proceed or decide to amend the rule. Mr. Nye explained that occasionally the Administrative Rules process requires a need for very minor adjustments, therefore, he requested that the Board's motion allows DFCM the latitude to make minor adjustments in the text throughout the rulemaking process. Any significant changes would be brought back to the Board.

MOTION: Joe Jenkins moved that the Board accept the rule as submitted and allow it to go through the rulemaking process with the understanding that if there is any housekeeping matters that need to be addressed, they can be addressed. After the 30-day period it will be brought back to the Board for final approval. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

☐ UTAH TERRITORIAL STATEHOUSE RENOVATION

Kent Beers stated the Building Board previously authorized DFCM to use \$250,000 to complete a study of the Territorial Statehouse with the understanding that the remaining balance could then be applied toward addressing some concerns identified in the study. The completed study identified principal concerns totaling \$500,000 needing repair including the electrical system, ADA access, seismic safety, and other miscellaneous concerns. DFCM

identified various funding sources to complete the repairs and recommended transferring the remaining balance from last year of \$234,500, \$22,000 from previously allocated capital improvement projects, \$34,2000 from Parks and Recreation for ADA repairs, and \$220,000 from the \$10 million appropriated by the Legislature to Parks and Recreation also be applied to total \$510,700 to complete the repairs. Lynn Hinrichs from DFCM, Gary Thorson from Parks and Recreation, and Scott Evans, architects were available to address the concerns in more detail.

Lynn Hinrichs displayed drawings from the study and noted page 19 of the study identified a master plan phasing schedule for DFCM's proposed spending schedule. Mr. Hinrichs and the committee spent considerable time reviewing the existing facility and older studies and felt the master plan could be accomplished with the existing funds beginning with asbestos abatement. A seismic study needs to occur to determine the amount of work needed to seismically upgrade the facility and the cost.

New electrical service also needed to be addressed due to additional rerouting of power required inside the building in order to fix hazardous conditions existing for several years. A new heating source is also needed to run from the facility to the pod. The final phase would be to tear down the existing annex on the north side of the facility and replace it with a new annex. DFCM provided efforts to attempt to save the existing annex built in 1930 and remodel it into a functional, long-term facility. DFCM realized that it could not provide access to all levels of the statehouse through the existing annex and therefore developed a different approach with state historical architect, Don Hartley, and determined the annex was not considered a historical part of the building and could be removed. The proposed annex by DFCM would solve the functional need of getting to every level of the statehouse and provide accessible restroom facilities. The long term vision for the project is to build an addition of a museum, which would be underground and adjacent to the statehouse, as was originally intended and designed by the architect Truman Angel.

Mr. Hinrichs reviewed the drawings and stated the current site plan would force all traffic to enter through First South in order to provide a nicer gateway into the project and draw tourists into the facility. On the 300-400 feet from the parking to the facility, they anticipate placing historical markers en route to the new annex. Stone markers would be placed in the landscape to identify the building perimeter. Mr. Hinrichs thought the new annex could envelop the concept of the first intentions of the rotunda. The Fillmore community and Parks and Recreation have expressed interest in developing a more modern condition.

A little larger view identified an elevator and stairways leading to the new annex area. Within the next five to six years, they may desire to seek funds to place an additional annex in the basement and build out the museum. The support space would include management office

space, a library and exhibit space. The main floor would encompass the new annex and entry into the Statehouse from the lobby area. The elevator would be costly and challenging due to the need to stop at half levels and the main story not being on ground level.

Directly north of the building, the State only owns approximately 15 feet of ground and would have to purchase additional space owned by the City in order to facilitate the plan. Mr. Hinrichs felt it was likely that the City would be willing to work with DFCM, and both wished to encourage the existing park like setting.

A sprinkling system did not exist in the current facility or in the plan, but may be added in the future. This would also present a challenge due to the stone walls.

Chairman Adams felt the City of Fillmore should gift the additional ground to the State in order to obtain a viable, economic development within the community. He also thought enough money was being allocated to accommodate sprinkling system in the building in order to preserve future allocation of funds for the master plan. If the fire sprinklers were added and covered by \$20,000, Richard Byfield proposed increasing the allocation of \$510,000. Mr. Thorson wished to confer with Courtland Nelson before proceeding, as there was currently only \$523,000 available for the project. Mr. Byfield offered to coordinate with Parks with the Board's approval and then return only if there were complications. This would allow the project to proceed.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to approve the funds with an additional \$20,000 of capital improvement funds to put the fire sprinkling system in and request that the State Division of Parks and Recreation ask the city of Fillmore to provide the additional ground needed to carry out the master plan. The motion was seconded by Joe Jenkins and passed unanimously.

Richard Byfield stated Chairman Adams' term was concluding as the Governor designated a new chair, Joe Jenkins, and congratulated Mr. Jenkins on his new assignment for the Building Board. Mr. Byfield then presented a certificate of appreciation to David Adams in recognition of his valued contributions and dedicated service to the Utah State Building Board from August 1, 1994 to May 2, 2001 and the services as Chairman from July 15, 1999 to May 2, 2001. He was also recognized for his invaluable guidance on the reorganization of DFCM and the successful implementation of Value Based Selection. Mr. David W. Adams also provided a commitment to excellent and public service, the capitol needs assessment program, and along with Keith Stepan's direction, aided the adoption of the new owner/architect agreement.

Joe Jenkins added Mr. Adams was also instrumental in the standardization of buildings to decrease the cost through modular concepts. He expressed his appreciation and desire to continue until it is in place.

Raylene Ireland acknowledged Chairman Adams as an exceptional Chair of the Building Board on behalf of the Governor's office and the Department of Administrative Services. She could was unaware of a Chairman who had changed the landscape as he had. She personally noted the way he redefined the Board to revitalize it as a unit to play on the important issues during the Legislature. She stood in admiration and appreciation for the work that he completed towards his vision.

Chairman Adams stated Joe Jenkins was very well qualified to continue to refine the process concludes the work undertaken.

MOTION: Keith Stepan moved that the Board formally commend Chairman Adams in regards to the comments made. Joe Jenkins seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

☐ DELEGATION OF DIXIE COLLEGE HURRICANE AND STUDENT CENTER PROJECTS.....

Richard Byfield explained there was a previous delegation of the project to construct the original building in Hurricane and now wished to modify the request to use a general contractor versus local labor. Under the prior project, DFCM was responsible to oversee the preparation of the documents and inspect the project while under construction. DFCM anticipated aiding Mr. Carnahan in the additional contract for services for the additional building in Hurricane.

DFCM took a more neutral position regarding the student center project. He asked Mr. Carnahan to present Dixie College's desire to seek both projects for delegation versus working inside the DFCM structure.

Mr. Carnahan explained the needs behind the delegation and distributed a handout referencing the Hurricane project and identifying the existing facility. The contractors and citizens of eastern Washington County donated approximately 8.5 acres of property. Since then another donor has stepped forward to fund an addition to the facility. The current facility has 3 classrooms, and additional five smaller classrooms would be beneficial. Mr. Carnahan has been requested to establish the project in as little time as possible, and therefore, wished to delegate the project. Although the delegation criteria states no state funds will be involved in the project, Dixie State College will request O&M costs. The infrastructure is in place due

to the first building, and most of the utilities will serve the expansion. Dixie College proposed to hire a professional architect/engineering team and bid it to a general contractor.

Mr. Carnahan thought delegating the project would help with the community college relationship currently unfolding in eastern Washington County and their desire for education. Mr. Carnahan sought comments on the Hurricane project.

Chairman Adams stated the building is slab on-grade, wood frame construction with stucco walls and a cement tile roof. It has residential quality HVAC equipment and has commercial plumbing fixtures and elements of construction that a normal homebuilder could adequately construct the building without any difficulty. It would be subject to inspection and control during the course of construction and the approval from DFCM.

Joe Jenkins expressed opposition to delegating further responsibilities from DFCM and did not intend to set it up as a precedent. He was more amenable to this project, simply because it was built by other people, but hoped institutions understood the degree of safety for having DFCM involved. Ned Carnahan stated Dixie College also felt DFCM involvement was beneficial, but felt an urgency to move ahead as quickly as possible in order to have the facility completed for the next academic year. Schematic work and estimations have begun as well.

MOTION: Joe Jenkins moved to approve the delegation of the Dixie State College Hurricane student center. He did not wish to delegate the second project.

Raylene Ireland stated approximately eight years ago, Nolan Karras, former chairman of the Building Board, determined to allow delegation to the University of Utah and Utah State University, but was adamant they would not allow other delegation items to proceed with other Universities except in rare exceptions. The Building Board did not wish to foster the development of architectural and engineering staff in the individual college communities and the state at the same time. She also felt very strongly that the second request from Dixie College was out of line.

Keith Stepan concurred with Joe Jenkins' comments and felt Dixie State College should focus on educating individuals and not on the administrations of construction projects.

Keith Stepan seconded the motion.

Mr. Carnahan accepted the motion with gratitude and will proceed with DFCM on both projects

in accordance with the will of the Board.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Adams referred to the Value Based Procurement schedule and reminded the Board of the significant line of work lying before them and the importance of a Board member attending the Value Based Procurement series on the various projects. The Board determined that Board members would be excused from the discussions if the project is under \$1.5 million, unless it is deemed controversial. Chairman Adams offered to participate on selection committees if members of the Board or citizen members could not be located.

Chairman Adams invited staff to eliminate for consideration any contractor proposal that was non-responsive as a qualification they were not qualified to proceed with further consideration.

Chairman Adams called for volunteers throughout June. A copy of the schedule is attached. He asked to serve as the public member on the four classroom projects on May 22 as well as the final selection of the winning firm in August.

Richard Byfield shared an anonymous letter DFCM received with the Board. There were a series of charges of inappropriateness on behalf of DFCM's work with Utah Correctional Industries in the roofing and paving area. He offered the information to the Building Board for observation in case they wished to offer advice.

Mr. Byfield distributed Mr. Clasby's response to provide information of facts. Chairman Adams requested a brief history of the involvement of UCI in construction related activities over the last 15 years. Mr. Clasby stated Utah Correctional Industries is a self-supporting division of the Department of Corrections. Their mission is to provide inmates with skills and work opportunities that translate to employment when they get released from prison. Mr. Jenkins was instrumental in their Legislation creating them as a division.

Approximately 12 years ago, UCI began the asbestos abatement program and have continued to work very successfully. Under that program, they also included roofing under the under the direction of DFCM. The particular letter suggested the relationship between DFCM and Correctional Industries may be inappropriate and not in the best interest of the State. Some concern was expressed at a hearing for the asbestos abatement program, based on the sophistication of the inmates to perform the asbestos abatement program safely. UCI determined they were well in compliance with legislation and provided the procurement code, which allows government agencies, including DFCM, to contract directly with each other. UCI has met all of the statutory requirements for performing the program and the 28 different businesses. Of the 1000 inmates employed, success ratio is quite good. He expressed appreciation to DFCM for their help and efforts.

Joe Jenkins questioned who provided the tools for the program. Richard Byfield responded that DFCM has taken that position of providing the capitalization to eliminate it as part of the fee or the rate structure. DFCM has also asked UCI to provide the capitalization, however they are not in a strong position to capitalize for new paths or activities. Therefore, DFCM capitalized the concept and differential required in providing the program.

Mr. Clasby stated that a vast majority of their work is done under DFCM. Historically, the program began as a cooperative venture between UCI and DFCM while UCI grew and developed. When UCI began excelling and became more diversified, they assumed more of the operational aspects. All of the training necessary for the staff and inmates is provided, and the program has proven to decrease the recidivism rate by less the 1/3 of parolees and probationers.

Chairman Adams felt the Board should support the UCI's efforts in teaching trades and educating the inmates. He acknowledged the complaint, but voted to continue to support UCI.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM.....

Kenneth Nye reported significant items were noted in the executive summary of the overall report. All statewide accounts were improving, and the contingency fund balance was increasing due to efforts to control its use and the impact of Value Based Procurement on contractor initiated change orders. Mr. Byfield stated each project is funded with a certain amount of contingency due to unforeseen conditions or legitimate unforeseen scope changes.

DFCM is eliminating document flaws and pursuing the errors and omissions issues much more vigorously. DFCM anticipates saving money on contingency and being able to return money to the Legislature for reappropriation in the future.

❑ OTHER

Jack Quintana provided a brief history on the capital needs assessment program beginning in 1997 when the Legislature passed HB3. House Bill 3 created two significant programs relative to maintenance and maintenance management of state facilities and emphasizing issues for facility condition assessments and facility audits. Facility audits are performed by in-house staff who audit all state facility preventative maintenance programs based on a set of standards adopted by the Building Board. DFCM has effectively audited 37,000,000sf of property twice and will complete the third round, which will effectively complete the audits. The Building Board's standard was set at 90% for buildings. DFCM currently has an 88% average identifying that agencies are focusing on accomplishing preventative maintenance programs. The facility condition assessment program sends a pre-contracted team of professionals to

visit each facility and perform a condition assessment of the building's structural, mechanical, and electrical areas. DFCM anticipates accomplishing condition assessments on all state buildings by October 2001 and providing the information to all state institutions and agencies through a database by June of 2001. Each agency and institution will be able to access the database for their managing initiatives and efforts. DFCM will also distribute the information to the UAPPA group to enable them to access the information and aid DFCM in maintaining accurate information.

Jeff Reddoor stated DFCM has been establishing and implementing the database over the last 18-24 months. He identified the populated databases and their intentions for the use of the database. The building structures could be viewed alphabetically or by the risk management number.

Some items included in the system have identified deficiencies. The architects and engineers gather the information based on the facility itself, useful life, and original cost and then identify the facility replacement cost.

The database included pictures of the facility with its identified deficiencies. An executive summary of the exterior, interior, structural, mechanical, electrical, and floors were also included.

Secondly, they identify profiles of the facility in three categories consisting of architectural profiles, engineering profiles, and hazardous materials profiles. The information in the architectural profiles consists of the type of facility, square footage, year built, number of elevators, facility replacement cost, and historical classification. It also contains the building construction, percentage of glass, and the type, amount, and square footage of the roofing. The flooring is identified by the different elements of the flooring, and its related square footage. The architects and engineers identify accessibility issues, essentially ADA issues, and then populate the tab accordingly. A miscellaneous tab identified the type of parking structures, the restrooms, and additional building notes.

The engineering profile provided slightly more detail on the structure including fire safety, products, types of fire systems and the adjustability, emergency power, and general plumbing information and is also gathered from the architects and engineers. Electrically, they identify the feeder voltage, secondary voltage, and disconnect voltage. HVAC is also identified in the system based on the type of heating and cooling in the system and the type of distribution.

As the hazardous material reports return from the asbestos section, the information is placed in the hazardous materials inventory. The reports identify which rooms contain certain hazardous materials and their location, the sampling firm, the cost of removal, the type of

asbestos and its hazardous ranking.

Once the information is received, DFCM can retrieve all the facility's deficiencies identified in the process of site visits. The building code and a category code identify upgrades. The information is viewed and distributed to the Program Directors and others associated with the project and provide basic information pertaining to the type of upgrades, the facilities priorities and other general information. Referencing, related pictures, and codes in violation, a brief description of the project, and cost are all provided within the information also. Local indexes will be updated annually based on inflation rates throughout the state. Indexes are based on professional fees and gross contractor markup fees and then DFCM determines the percentages for the contracts.

DFCM determined the facility replacement cost were relatively low and ask to develop those costs based on local economy, local indexes, and local construction costs. Those costs have been tabulated and based on those local costs. DFCM is also in the process of working with Risk Management to coordinate numbers to obtain current, accurate replacement costs of facilities throughout the state. DFCM also has an inflation rate that indexes into that as well.

Mr. Reddoor also displayed drawings related to the building and facility, which DFCM or the Agency can refer to and review the project based on the complete drawings. Currently, the database holds approximately 75-80% of the facilities, including the University of Utah.

Richard Byfield recalled the Board previously approved the design standards for CADD production documents. They scanned documents for reference and all new documents will be in an active format. DFCM will work with UCI to digitize drawings of old buildings that will be remodeled to develop more active information. This will also allow DFCM the ability to red mark progress prints over the Internet. As documents arrive at DFCM, they will be loaded into the file in hopes to become more paperless and allow agencies and DFCM staff the ability to get data to prepare reports and analysis. This will also permit DFCM the ability to do an analysis and suggest future improvement projects. It will also look in the future of A/E fee expenditures and construction costs, while aiding in the ability to estimate new projects and assess building replacement costs. DFCM is still determining authority designations on changing the data.

Richard Byfield commended DFCM staff for going beyond the call of duty and pursuing the concept to ensure this effort was the best for the State, and the work of the future. Jack Quintana added they also wished to provide Chairman Adams an idea of the legacy he leaves behind. The fully integrated, comprehensive system allowing DFCM and the Building Board the ability to have real time information to help make better decisions. It will provide a much better positioning in the system of budgeting in the state to provide a more constant flow of

dollars to renovate and replace our existing buildings on a consistent basis. Utah is being recognized as a true leader in terms of information management and is becoming recognized as a leader in terms of using information.

☐ ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Joe Jenkins moved to adjourn the meeting and give a formal recognition to David Adams for his years of service. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen